Exhibit 300: Part I: Summary Information and Justification (All Capital Assets)

I.A. Overview

1. Date of Submission:	
2. Agency:	Department of State
3. Bureau:	RM/DCFO/GFMS Global Financial Management System
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	Travel Manager Program
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	014-00-01-01-1228-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)	Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2001 or earlier

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

The DoS/USAID strategic plan mission statement is succinct, "Create a more secure, democratic, and prosperous world for the benefit of the American people and the international community". This requires a world-class travel support infrastructure, especially for international travel. This investment involves migrating to a GSA-approved e-Gov Travel provider and maintaining/operating the current travel system during the transition in order to fully align this mission critical support function with the PMA. INVESTMENT BENEFITS In addition to the government-wide share-in cost savings and other gains noted in GSA's business case, this investment will yield two major improvements: - The productivity gains/reduced transaction fees derived from using an Online Booking Tool. This, coupled with lower travel agent fees, will likely lead to improved morale and projected airline booking fee savings. Worldwide paperless processing including automated electronic routing and approvals, which should yield better controls/accountability. STATUS FY05 and then FY06 was envisioned as the project's pivotal transition year as the software and its associated deployment methodology would be "piloted", improved upon, and then validated through overseas deployment at several posts. This has been extended into FY07 because of significant FY06/FY07 funding cuts and chronic CWGT service delivery issues ranging from its FY05 software recall to more recent repeated delays in deploying key international functionality. This led to the development of a more compressed deployment at the suggestion of GSA and is predicated on CWGT meeting all future delivery schedules and the ability to employ a more efficient overseas training methodology. The FY08 resources being requested will be used to: - Manage the investment following the MSP methodology - Implement the eTS training/migration schedule - Provide steady state maintenance support for the system being replaced This FY08 submission contains risk-adjusted cost and schedule estimates where approp

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	8/4/2006
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.	No
a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	Yes

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	No
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?	Yes
If "yes," check all that apply:	Human Capital, Financial Performance, Expanded E-Government, Competitive Sourcing, Eliminating Improper Payments, Right Sized Overseas Presence
13a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?	Competitive Sourcing and Expanded e-Government - DoS selected CWGT after evaluating each of the e-Gov Travel providers approved by GSA/OMB. Improved financial performance, such as better money management and lower travel provisioning costs, through the use of online booking, automated travel authorizations/claims, and interfaces with agency financial systems. Right-sized overseas presence - Reduced data entry and technical support duties will free up about ½ staff person's time per post.
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?	No
b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?	
c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?	
15. Is this investment for information technology?	Yes
If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technologous answer this sub-section.	ogy?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do
For information technology investments only:	
16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 1
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance):	(2) Project manager qualification is under review for this investment
18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?	Yes
19. Is this a financial management system?	Yes
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	Yes
1. If "yes," which compliance area:	Promotes integration of financial management systems (including timely and accurate recording of financial data) and adherence to federal accounting standards through the use of a GSA/OMB approved e-Gov Travel system.

b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52

Travel Manager (TM+) and e-2 Solutions, which is available through GSA's Master Service Agreement with CWGT.

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	0
Software	1
Services	65
Other	34
21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?	N/A
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	Yes

I.D. Performance Information

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

	Performance Information Table 1:							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)			
2003	Goal 4: Leveraging IT to Streamline Operations	Increase level of coverage to users to 100% reducing staff costs by Approximately \$535,000	70%	% of domestic posts or bureaus using Travel Manager	Increased %number of domestic bureaus or eligible posts using Travel Manager to 100%			
2004	Management and Organizational Excellence	Increase travel data retrieval and reporting capability for domestic bureaus by 5 reports resulting in increased level of	0%	Number of reports available on travel costs and related information.	As of 9/30/04, three reports were available in production			

		travel accountability and improved quality and timeliness of financial statements		
2004	Management and Organizational Excellence	Maintain 100% service coverage level to users resulting in continued staff reduction savings of \$1,070,000.	using Travel Manager	As of 9/30/04, 100% of eligible posts or bureaus using Travel Manager continued to receive 100% service coverage for users, and maintained staff reduction savings.

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

	Performance Information Table 2:								
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results		
2005	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	% of travel reservations worldwide booked via self-service on-line tool	0%	4%	As of 08/31/05, 0%. Unable to accomplish due to funding cutback and vendor software recall.		
2005	Mission and Business Results	Administrative Management	Travel	% of TDY travel vouchers processed via fully automated, end-to-end travel service system (Travel Manager or eTS)	35%	43%	As of 08/31/05, 35%. Unable to accomplish due to funding cutback and vendor software recall.		
2005	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Reduce % of staff time needed to process travel activity by using the automated travel management system	100% of one person's staff time	Reduce by 25%	As of 08/31/05, 100% of one person's time. Unable to accomplish due to funding cutback and vendor software recall.		
2005	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	# of quality reports available to management on travel costs and related information	3	4	As of 08/31/05, 4		
2006	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	% of travel reservations worldwide booked via self-service on-line tool	0%	2% (by year-end)	As of 03/31/06, 3%.		
2006	Mission and Business Results	Administrative Management	Travel	%of TDY travel vouchers processed via fully automated, end-to-end travel service system (Travel Manager or eTS)	35%	36%	As of 03/31/06, 36%.		
2006	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Time required to generate automated reimbursements to overseas employees supported by "E-2 solutions".	6 days	5 days (on average).			
2006	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	# of quality reports available to management on travel costs and related information	3	6	As of 3/31/06, 4		
2007	Customer Results	Service	Access	% of travel reservations worldwide	0%	5% (by year end)			

		Accessibility		booked via self-service on-line tool		
2007		Administrative Management	Travel	% of TDY travel vouchers processed via fully automated, end-to-end travel service system (Travel Manager or eTS)	35%	38% (by year end)
2007	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	# of quality reports available to management on travel costs and related information	3	7
2008	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	% of travel reservations worldwide booked via self-service on-line tool	0%	10%
2008		Administrative Management	Travel	% of TDY travel vouchers processed via fully automated, end-to-end travel service system (Travel Manager or eTS)	35%	40% (by year end)
2008		Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Time required to generate automated reimbursements to overseas employees supported by "E-2 solutions".	6 days	4 days (on average).
2008	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	# of quality reports available to management on travel costs and related information	3	8

I.E. Security and Privacy

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

All systems supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system/s to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system/s.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

- 1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:
- 2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.
- 5. Have any weaknesses related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?
 - a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated agency's plan of action and milestone process?

No Yes

Yes

Yes

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?

a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

	8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:							
Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Is the PIA available to the public?	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?			
Travel Manager	No	Yes.	Yes.	YES	No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.			

I.F. Enterprise Architecture (EA)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?

Yes

No

- a. If "no," please explain why?
- 2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

Yes

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

Travel Manager

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Service Reference Model (SRM) Table:

Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	FEA Service Component Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
Activity-Based Management	Support a defined, specific set of finance-related tasks for a given objective	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Activity-Based Management	Expense Management	023-10-01-14-01- 0220-24	External	0
Expense Management	Support the management and reimbursement of costs paid by	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Expense Management	Expense Management	023-10-01-14-01- 0220-24	External	0

	employees or an organization							
Travel Management	Support the transit and mobility of an organization's employees for business purposes	Back Office Services	Human Resources	Travel Management	Travel Management	023-10-01-14-01- 0220-24	External	100
Assistance Request	Support the solicitation of support from a customer	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Assistance Request	Assistance Request	023-10-01-14-01- 0220-24	External	0

Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Travel Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	Crystal Enterprise
Travel Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Internet Explorer
Travel Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Progress Software

Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

Yes

a. If "yes," please describe.

When completed, this investment will have resulted in the retirement of a legacy travel management system -- which is one of the key aims of the e-Gov Travel initiative and, related to this, leverage the government-wide e-Gov Travel application made available through GSA, the Managing Partner for this program.

6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?

INO

a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a

specific web browser version)?

1. If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

II.A. Alternatives Analysis

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A- 94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?	4/29/2004
b. If "no." what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?	

c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Reduced requirements for hardware, software, and contractor labor as eTS obviates the need for some portion of these costs; Savings in airline booking fees; Reduced staff costs associated with integration of eTS with the overseas global financial system; and, the elimination of double data entry.

II.B. Risk Management

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?	8/31/2005
b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

- 2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?
- 3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

Travel Manager/e-Gov Travel investment risks are evaluated along two dimensions: potential impact and probability of occurrence. Risks determined to have a medium or higher probability of occurrence (greater than 30% chance) and/or a medium or higher impact (e.g., moderate to significant cost, schedule or scope change) are required to follow the mitigation strategy, contingency planning, and risk-adjusted life cycle costs estimation methodology contained in the Travel Manager Risk Management Plan. Life cycle estimates are risk adjusted by determining the incremental cost associated with addressing priority risks and applying the probability to this amount. Schedule adjustments are computed in a similar manner -- i.e., the incremental schedule impact is first determined and then adjusted based on probability of occurrence. For example, all of the FY08 milestones related to overseas deployment of the e-Gov Travel solution have been risk adjusted due to the challenges associated with compressing the rollout schedule to satisfy GSA's preferred completion date.